

### REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. Claims 1-29 stand rejected. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of claims 30-33,. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, and 21 have been amended. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made for cosmetic reasons to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action reject claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 14, 15, 20-22, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enmei in view of Yoshioka. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. The prior art references must also teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim in question. See, M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). A reference can only be used for what it clearly discloses or suggests. See, In re Hummer, 113 U.S.P.Q. 66 (C.C.P.A. 1957); In re Stencel, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, the references, whether taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention claimed by the Applicant.

The Office Action admits that the cited references do not teach alone or in combination a retrieving said destination data by selecting said portion of said image

and dialing a call utilizing said destination data or, a search report retrieving destination data based on coordinates of a portion of said image selected by said selector, a calling device for calling using the destination data retrieved by said searcher. Each of independent claims 1, 9, 15, and 21 have been amended to recite the above limitations. As such, Applicant asserts that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-8, and 29 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 1. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 2-8 and 29 should also be allowed.

Claims 10-14 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 9. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 9, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 10-14 should also be allowed.

Claims 16-20 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 15. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 15, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 16-20 should also be allowed.

Claims 22-28 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 21. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 21, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 22-28 should also be allowed.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: July 14, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs